REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to more clearly define the invention in accordance with the specification. Thus Claim 1 now recites that the blue phosphor layer consists of the first phosphor and the second phosphor as shown on page 3, line 30-page 4, line 6and page 5, line 18-page 7, lined 2. In addition, Claims 1 and 2, now recite that the light emission from the second phosphor is a visible light radiation as shown on page 1, lines 25-28 of the specification.

The rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-9 under 325 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Do et al. is considered to lack merit.

The Do et al. patent is not considered to teach, or even suggest, the color picture screen defined by even Claim 1, the most generic claim.

Unlike the color picture screen defined by Claim 1, the color picture screen of the Do et al. patent does not have a blue phosphor layer which contains a phosphor having a visible light emission in the range from 380 to 450 nm in addition to a blue phosphor having a light emission in the range from 430 to 490 nm..

While the color picture screen of the Do et al. patent comprises a blue phosphor layer comprising a blue phosphor, the blue phosphor layer does not also contain a phosphor having a visual light emission in the range of from 380 to 450 nm. Instead, as shown in column 2, lines 24-52 the blue phosphor layer of the color picture screen of the do et al patent comprises, in addition to a blue phosphor, a UV phosphor.

The color picture screen defined by Claim 3 is considered to be even further removed from the Do et al. patent in the failure of the Do et al. patent to teach, or even suggest, the presence of a second phosphor activated in the manner recited in Claim 3

The rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Do et al. in view of Hagiwara et al. and Fu et al. is considered to lack merit.

The Do et al. patent is not considered to teach, or even suggest, the color picture screen defined by Claim 4. Unlike the color picture screen defined by Claim 4, the color picture screen of the Do et al. patent does not consist of any of the "second" phosphors recited in Claim 4 in addition to the phosphor having a light emission in the range from 430-490 nm

The combination of Hagiwara et al and Fu et al is not considered to fill in the above noted gaps in the teaching of the Do et al. patent. While the combination of Hagiwara et al. and fu et al my be considered to suggest a color picture screen having a blue phosphor layer containing one of the "second" phosphors recited in Claim 4, this combination does not teach, or even suggest, that the blue phosphor layer consist additionally only of a "first" phosphor having a light emission in the range from 430 to 490 nm.

The rejection of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Do et al. in view of Hitachi Ltd is considered to lack merit.

The Do et al. patent is not considered to teach, or even suggest, the color picture screen define by claims 5 and 6 for reasons given in regard to parent Claim 1.

The Hitachi Ltd patent is not considered to fill the above-noted gaps in the teaching of the Do et al. patent. Unlike the blue phosphor layer of the color picture

screen defined by Claim 1, and like the blue phosphor layer of the Do et al. patent, the blue phosphor layer of the Hitachi et al. patent is not shown therein to contain a phosphor having a visible light emission in the range from 380-450 nm..

An early allowance of the claims and case is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Norman N. Spain
Norman N. Spain, Reg. 17,846
Attorney
(914) 333-9653